



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/928,610

08/13/2001

Fred S. Cook

1480

7517

28004

7590

12/20/2006

SPRINT

6391 SPRINT PARKWAY

KSOPHT0101-Z2100

OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER

HU, JINSONG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

12/20/2006

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/928,610	<b>Applicant(s)</b> COOK, FRED S.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jinsong Hu	<b>Art Unit</b> 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-17,19-28 and 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 18 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The Final Action mailed on 10/3/06 is withdrawn because one prior art reference of 103(a) rejection and the application have common assignee. This Office Action is based upon the amendments filed on 7/13/06. Claims 1- 32 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 12 and 22 are amended.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-13, 16-17, 19-22, 25-27 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6,026,078) in view of Gimple et al. (US 4,430,731).

4. As per claim 1, Smith teaches the invention as claimed including a communication hub [44, Fig. 3] comprising:

a control system [Fig. 3] configured to switch between either a configuration mode [i.e., hub mode, the port will receive the request from network device and performs configuration for a new device in this mode] or an operation mode [i.e., station

Art Unit: 2154

mode; col.1, line 60 – col. 2, line 9], wherein responsive to the configuration mode the control system is configured to receive a registration request from an unauthorized communication device [col. 3, lines 40-48] and process the registration request to automatically authorize the communication device for use with the communication hub [col. 3, lines 49-60], and wherein responsive to switching to the operation mode the control system is configured to control an exchange of communications between a plurality of previously authorized communication devices, the newly authorized communication device, and a network system [col. 3, line 61- col. 4, line 13];

a mode selection interface [56, Fig. 3] configured to receive an input from a user that selects one of the configuration mode and the operation mode, and process the input to cause the control system to enter the selected one of the configuration mode and the operation mode [col. 4, lines 43 – 61]; and

an interface [58, Fig. 3] system configured to receive the registration request and exchange the communications between the plurality of previously registered communication devices, the newly registered communication device, and a network system [col. 5, lines 17-25].

5. Smith also teaches the network device is any device which being able to communicate to other devices through a network port [col. 3, lines 30-39]. Smith does not specifically teach the network device sending an off-hook signal to the hub. However, in the same field as Smith's reference, Gimple on the other hand teaches the network device sending an off-hook signal to the hub [col. 22, line 64 – col. 23, line 15].

Art Unit: 2154

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Gimple's off-hook signal sending step in aaa's system because it is a well-known feature in the art for notifying a communication hub or central office that the network device will send an order soon to the hub or central office. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Smith's system to improve the integrity of the system.

6. As per claim 4, Smith teaches the control system is configured to cause the mode selection interface to indicate to the user that the newly authorized communication device is configured for use with the communication hub [col. 4, lines 43 – 61; col. 5, lines 17-25].

7. As per claim 5, Smith teaches the step of recording the communication device in the communication hub as an allowed communication device [col. 3, lines 49-60].

8. As per claim 6, Smith teaches the step of processing the registration request to generate a query message for the unauthorized communication device that includes a request for a device identifier and processing a response message from the unauthorized communication device that includes the device identifier to record the device identifier as an allowed communication device in the communication hub [col. 3, lines 49-60].

Art Unit: 2154

9. As per claim 9, Smith teaches control system is configured to use device identifier to identify communication requests made by the newly authorized communication device [col. 3, lines 49-60].

10. As per claim 10, Smith and Gimple teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not specifically teach the communication device is a wireless communication device. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wireless communication device in the combination system of Smith/Gimple because doing so would increase the functionality of the system by allowing the users select the device they prefer or need. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination system of Smith/Gimple with wireless communication device to provide more option to users.

11. As per claim 11, Smith teaches the communication device is a wireless communication device [12,14, etc. Fig.1].

12. As per claim 12, since it is a method claim of claim 1, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 1 above.

13. As per claim 13, since it is a method claim of claim 4, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 4 above.

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claim 16, since it is a method claim of claim 5, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 5 above.

15. As per claim 17, since it is a method claim of claim 6, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 6 above.

16. As per claim 19, since it is a method claim of claim 9, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 9 above.

17. As per claim 20, since it is a method claim of claim 10, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 10 above.

18. As per claim 21, since it is a method claim of claim 11, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 11 above.

19. As per claim 22, since it is a product claim of claim 1, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 1 above.

20. As per claim 25, since it is a product claim of claim 4, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 4 above.

Art Unit: 2154

21. As per claim 26, since it is a product claim of claim 5, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 5 above.

22. As per claim 27, since it is a product claim of claim 6, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 6 above.

23. As per claim 30, since it is a product claim of claim 9, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 9 above.

24. As per claim 31, since it is a product claim of claim 10, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 10 above.

25. As per claim 32, since it is a product claim of claim 11, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 11 above.

26. Claims 2-3, 7, 14-15, 23-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6,026,078) as applied to claims 1, 4-6, 8-13, 16-22, 25-27 and 29-32 above, in view of Reichmeyer et al. (US 6,286,038)

27. As per claim 2, Smith and Gimple teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not specifically teach generating a configuration completion message to user. However, Reichmeyer on the other hand teaches generating a



Art Unit: 2154

configuration completion message to user [col. 6, lines 39-42]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including Reichmeyer's message to the combination system of Smith/Gimple to make the system more user friendly by acknowledge the user without delay. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination system of Smith/Gimple to improve the quality of the service to attract more customs.

28. As per claim 3, Smith and Gimple teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not specifically teach generating a configuration completion message to user [col. 6, lines 39-42]. However, Reichmeyer on the other hand teaches generating a configuration completion message to user. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to including Reichmeyer's message to the combination system of Smith/Gimple to make the system more user friendly by acknowledge the user without delay. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination system of Smith/Gimple to improve the quality of the service to attract more customs.

29. As per claim 7, Smith and Gimple teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not specifically teach providing query message to the unauthorized communication device. However, Reichmeyer on the other hand teaches providing query message to the unauthorized communication device [col. 7, lines 51-58]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2154

invention was made to including Reichmeyer's message in the combination system of Smith/Gimple to make the system more user friendly by notifying the user what kind information should be entered for authorization.

30. As per claim 14, since it is a method claim of claim 2, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 2 above.

31. As per claim 15, since it is a method claim of claim 3, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 3 above.

32. As per claim 23, since it is a product claim of claim 2, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 2 above.

33. As per claim 24, since it is a product claim of claim 3, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 3 above.

34. As per claim 28, since it is a product claim of claim 7, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 7 above.

35. Claims 10, 20 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 6,026,078) as applied to claims 1, 4-6, 8-9, 11-13, 16-19, 21-22, 25-30 and 32 above.

Art Unit: 2154

36. As per claim 10, Smith teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1.

Smith does not specifically teach the communication device is a wireless communication device. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wireless communication device in Smith's system because doing so would increase the functionality of the system by allowing the users select the device they prefer or need. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Smith's system with wireless communication device to provide more option to users.

37. As per claim 20, since it is a method claim of claim 10, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 10 above.

38. As per claim 31, since it is a product claim of claim 10, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 10 above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

39. Claims 8, 18 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

40. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

41. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

42. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

43. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

December 14, 2006



VIET D. VU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER